

- 3 -

Docket: 0756-945

removing a peripheral portion of said expanded laser beam through a mask to form a masked laser beam, said peripheral portion including at least edges of said expanded laser beam extending in said first direction;

condensing said masked laser beam in a second direction orthogonal to said first direction to form a condensed laser beam [at the object], said condensed laser beam having a line-shaped transverse cross-section at the object [being line-shaped]; and

changing the relative location of said object with respect to said [line-shaped] laser beam so that said object is scanned with said [line-shaped] laser beam.

REMARKS

The above amendment with the following remarks is submitted to be fully responsive to the Office Action of June 6, 1995. For the reasons outlined below, it is requested that this amendment be entered and this application be allowed.

The Examiner maintains her objection to the language of claims 1, 6 and 11 directed to the shape of the laser beam at the object. Specifically, the examiner asserts that defining a laser beam as line-shaped is indefinite. The examiner appears to suggest defining the beam spot as line-shaped, since the spot is formed on the object surface, not the beam. However, we note that the specification does not appear to use the phrase "beam spot". Therefore, in response, by this amendment, claims 1, 6 and 11 have been amended to clarify that the condensed laser beam has a line-shaped transverse cross-section at the object. Applicants believe this amended language is accurate and definite. Thus, withdrawal of this objection to claims 1-16, and any rejections to claims 1-16 based on the indefiniteness

No. 112
objection

- 4 -

Docket: 0756-945

of the "line-shaped" language, is in order and respectfully requested. Claims 1-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Yamazaki et al. '358, alone or in view of Yamazaki et al. '855 and Toshiba KK or NEC Corp. '131 or '123 or Traskos et al. or Hongo et al. or Krimmel et al. Previously, Applicants claimed priority based on Japanese priority application 61-229252 in order to remove Yamazaki et al. '358 as prior art. The examiner now requires a showing that all information in presently pending claims 1-16 are supported by application 61-229252. The remarks hereinbelow are provided to show that all information in the present amended claims is from the Japanese priority application 61-229252.

The '252 priority application discloses all the claimed subject matter of the present application. The certified English translation of the '252 application, previously submitted to the examiner, clearly describes on page 3, line 18 - page 4, line 23 the claimed structure and steps of the present invention including emitting a rectangular laser beam, expanding the beam in a first direction, removing a portion of the beam through a mask wherein the portion includes edges of the expanded beam, and condensing the beam in a second direction orthogonal to the first direction to form a line-shaped laser beam on an object. Moreover, Fig. 1 shows the various components including a laser, expander, mask and condenser. Page 3, lines 18-22 specifically recognize the advantage of the claimed line-shaped beam in overcoming the problems of the prior art. In addition, page 6-8 describe specific examples of the method as claimed in the present application. Also, page 8, lines 1-5 in combination with Fig. 3 recognizes scanning the object to be treated in a direction orthogonal to the direction of expansion. In addition, page 6, lines 21-23 discloses the an insulating layer or glass attached to the object or layer being treated while Example

- 5 -

Docket: 0756-945

2 discussed on page 8, lines 7-17 discloses a semiconducting surface underlying the object as required by pending claims 5, 10 and 15 of the present application.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Yamazaki et al. '358 be removed as a prior art reference to the present application. With Yamazaki et al. '358 removed as a prior art reference, it is believed that the present rejections to claims 1-16 under 35 U.S.C. §103 are rendered moot and, therefore, have been overcome. Moreover, it is believed that the numerous other prior art references presently of record do not disclose or suggest the present invention as recited in amended claims 1, 11, and 16. Therefore, it is believed that independent claims 1, 11 and 16 are allowable and that dependent claims 2-10 and 12-15 are likewise allowable in that they depend from allowable base claims 1, 11, and 16. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejections under §103 is in order and respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner deems that any issue remains after considering this response, he is invited to call the undersigned to expedite the prosecution and work out any such issue by telephone.

Respectfully submitted,



Tim L. Brackett, Jr.
Reg. No. 36,092
SEXBEY, FRIEDMAN, LEEDOM
& FERGUSON, P.C.
2010 Corporate Ridge, Suite 600
McLean, Virginia 22102
(703) 790-9110

GJF/TLB